to determine intelligently his preference; and further in so far as to keep up a course of intelligent and responsible superintendence (having previously intelligently arranged the design in the drawings and specification) so that no inadvertency or error or fraud may be allowed to pass; and further in so far as to comprehend, in some degree, the universal question of cost, as a point never to be lost sight of by the agent of the employer; and, further still, in so far as to be able actually to direct the builder (whose science is most generally only empirical) in all matters of the science of construction or the science of common building work itself, so as, in short, to apply his theory to control and correct the builder's practical knowledge.

Whether the architect requires to attain a knowledge of all the arcana of very *bad* building, is chiefly a question of whether an individual chooses to be the agent of a client, whose object is to have fair work for fair pay, or to be the negro-driver of one of that unscrupulous class, whose purpose rather is to entrap a needy or "scamping" builder into a losing contract, and get all that is to be got out of him at the expense of his creditors; but that every student should acquire a knowledge of *good* building, and carefully learn the principles of *economical* building, is a rule of universal application to all who value their reputation, or aim at honourable success. And in these days of "competition," when you may sometimes turn the scale by a fallacious appearance of economy, or a false assertion of cheapness, beware, I beg of you; for not a few have made a few pounds for the present and many enemies for after-life by the necessity laid upon them by a bad system to adopt bad building, and make the best of it.

One remark more, and I have done with building. It is true that the separation which has taken place between the work of the measuring and valuing surveyor and the general province of the architect justifies the latter in declining, if he be so minded, to be architect and surveyor both; but at the same time no architect can dispense with such a knowledge of the facts of value as will enable him to proceed intelligently in this respect so important to his client; and the more he can conveniently acquire of the surveyor's knowledge the better for his own work.

When I come to look at the lamps of learning and teaching in my next, and deal with the antiquarian and the mission of the man of art and science, my discourse may be more entertaining; but it cannot be more profitable in its subject for the mission of the man of business, who would light his way by the last lamp of making a living. Therefore keep well in mind that even now the chief value of the architect to the world at large is as the master of the building, and that no taste in art or skill in science will prove by any means so practically profitable in business. K.

ON THE ARCHITECTURAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN CATHEDRAL AND PAROCHIAL CHURCHES.

It has often struck me on many different occasions that many, otherwise observant, architectural students have not fully grasped the great architectural difference which exists between the two main classes of ecclesiastical buildings, namely, ordinary parish churches on the one hand, and, on the other, cathedrals and those churches, chiefly conventual or collegiate, which present the same general artistic character. These last I will rank together under the general name of minsters, a term which may form a convenient appellative for the class of buildings referred to. My chief aim is to contribute something to establishing the existence of a marked distinction between the two, entirely irrespective of size, which is vulgarly supposed to be the only difference. I remember a paper a long time ago on the subject in the *Ecclesiologist*; but a line was naturally taken there somewhat different from that which I wish at present to work out. The distinction, as there drawn, was, if I rightly remember, chiefly ecclesiological, depending on points of ritual arrangement, and referred as a ground-work to the difference of expression naturally to be expected in churches intended for the general worship of the faithful, and those which specially belonged to religious societies; that the one class, in short, were *ad populum*, and the other *ad clerum*. I believe there is a good deal of truth in this view, especially as regards the earlier styles; but my business is rather with the architectural than the ecclesiastical distinction. I have called it a distinction irrespective of size; and yet I believe the difference of size to be at the root of the matter. It is irrespective of size, so far as this, that a parish church may often be larger than a minster, and yet each retain its distinctive character. This was well remarked in an ingenious paper on Christ Church Priory, read by Mr. Hope, at the Archæological meeting at Winchester, from which the reader who has no other means of information respecting that church will certainly not rise with any definite notion of its architecture, but from which he may carry away much matter for reflection connected with the subject of my present essay.

But I think it will appear that size is at the bottom of the distinction, from this consideration, namely, that though there is a wide debateable ground, the largest churches can be appropriately designed only on the one type, the smallest only on the other. A model of York minster, 60 or 80 feet long, would be an absurdity; while Binsey or Besselsleigh, dragged out by Procrustes to the length of 400 or 500 feet, would be an absurdity no less. Indeed, I think it would be by far the greater absurdity of the two. And from this difference in the amount of absurdity, if it be granted, I would make an inference, namely, that the cathedral type is, in itself, the highest type of building, and that the other is simply an admissible substitute for it. Imitation, however inappropriate, of a superior model, is a less evil than the degradation of the higher rank below its place. I hence infer, again, that in those buildings which, from their size, admit of either treatment, the higher model should be followed; though this rule was frequently violated by the ancient English architects, and seems to be hardly ever thought of by their successors. Of the former I need only mention our own Abbey of Dorchester, conceived on the very meanest parochial type: of the latter I need only refer to that structure of Mr. Pugin's, than which few buildings, old or new, supply a more admirable study of detail, but to which I should greatly doubt whether even the benediction of a Cardinal Archbishop can succeed in conveying in the least degree the distinctive character of our ancient minsters.

I have been thus far vaguely talking of the distinction between the two types of churches, without saying in what it consists. Now, the fact is, that I cannot tell you in what it consists, and my ignorance on that point is the chief piece of information which I have to communicate on this occasion. But though I cannot tell you what it is, I believe I can tell where it is to be found, and where it is not; and the remarks I may throw out on this head may be serviceable to others in finding out what the thing itself really is. I believe that if I have not found it out, the fault is not in the thing itself, but in my private idiosyncracy. I always find I can recognise a great deal which I have to get others to define; which I believe has something to do with the presence or absence of subjectivity or objectivity—two hard words, which, as I do not often find them either in Thucydides or Sismondi, I am always forgetting which is the one and which is the other.

Leaving it, then, for some one else to define the difference, to my own mind it appears equally unmistakeable and undefinable. I have said that it is not a mere difference in size: Newark, Boston, Coventry, are churches larger than many abbeys, and yet thoroughly parochial; while no church is more thoroughly a minster than St. Cross. It is not the cross form, which, though essential to the effect, is shared by many parish churches with hardly any approximation to the cathedral character. It is not multiplicity of towers: many noble minsters have but one or none, while some essentially parochial churches have more than one. The triforium is, in England at least, almost excluded from the parish church, but it is not necessary to the cathedral: the clerestory, though necessary, is of course anything but distinctive. It is not vaulting, which, though essential to the highest perfection, is not necessary to the attainment of a very high degree of excellence; and is, besides, always desirable, though so seldom met with, even in the smallest churches. Still less is it excess of ornament: it hardly needs demonstration that a minster may be as plain as is consistent with beauty, and a parish church exhibit the most lavish gorgeousness, without in the least departing from their respective characters. The cross form, and the presence of a clerestory, are the only characters which can be called necessary, and these manifestly are not of themselves sufficient. It is a character which I, at least, cannot describe in words, but which is perhaps the more easily felt, because of the difficulty in its description. It is like those distinctions of style and character among ages, nations, and individuals which are perceived without an effort, and yet are incapable of satisfactory definition. It is like the recognition of likeness in countenance, or of style in composition, by an immediate αἴσθησις, admitting of no description or demonstration.

I will now proceed to put together a few facts and observations which, as I before said, may possibly prove, in other hands, the means of falsifying the remarks which I have last made. Anterior to the distinction between cathedral and parochial churches, I would endeavour to make another; that is, between churches which are really works of art, and those whose beauty is derived from mere picturesque effect. There certainly is a large class of churches which at once fill the beholder, in my case at least, before any other feeling, with an irresistible desire to draw them from every conceivable point. Now these are not, for the most part, really grand or beautiful buildings, but some little out-of-the-way barn-like church, perhaps absolutely without detail, and conveying no one strictly architectural lesson. A congeries of high gables produces this effect more strongly than the most gorgeous range of aisle, clerestory, and flying buttress. A saddle-back roof, a square capping of tile, a stunted shingle spire, is preferable for this purpose to the gorgeous steeples of Taunton or Coventry. I had some years ago the pleasure of calling attention to the churches of Jersey, which partake a good deal of this type, though in some respects rising above it. Those of Kent and the Isle of Wight supply many instances; there are some also on the confines of Middlesex and Bucks, of which Stoke Pogis is a remarkable specimen. But the land for picturesque, as opposed to beautiful, churches, is the geographica, opposite to Kent,—Pembrokeshire. I really do not know that I have felt a delight greater in its own kind in contemplating the most magnificent fabrics of Northamptonshire or Somerset, than when I have stood on an eminence, with the church, as is so often the case, cradled in the valley at my feet; a high roofed nave and chancel, a vast porch projecting here, a diminutive transept there: the ground plan broken by further mysterious ins and outs, whose design might puzzle a deeper ecclesiologist than myself; a large bell-cot crowning the east gable of the nave; while, somewhere or other, north, south, or west, is attached the rude, tall, unbuttressed tower; the only English type to which Mr. Ruskin would apply the epithet "noble," being, indeed, "a bulwark unsupported by other bulwarks," and not unfrequently, owing to the stormy climate in which they are situated, enjoying the further advantage of "*rent* battlements."

Churches of this class are decidedly among the most satisfactory to the eye of any that exist. But I cannot think that their beauty is the higher beauty of real intellectual design, but rather that of mere picturesque effect. Our satisfaction at the sight of them rather resembles that derived from contemplating the irregularity of natural scenery than that which arises

For a comprehensive guide on OCR and PDF Compression go to our website